DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 874 HE 017 775

AUTHOR	Hanisch, Thor Einar; Vollmann, Wolfgang, Ed.
TITLE	A Review of Statewide Long-Range Planning. Commission Report 84-17.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	30 Apr 84
NOTE	44p.; One in a Series of Background Papers for the Commission's Long Range Planning Project, "A Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education, 1985-2000." For related document, see ED 247 832.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning; Coordination; Educational History; Government School Relationship; *Long Range Planning; *Master Plans; *Postsecondary Education; Public Education; *State Boards of Education; State Universities; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Bielefeld Centre for Interdisciplinary Research

ABSTRACT

The historical context for planning by the California Postsecondary Education Commission is considered, with attention to seven major planning documents. Information is provided on the origins, methods, and conclusions of the studies, as well as the relationship among the studies and the effects on master planning conducted since 1974. The titles and dates of the studies are as follows: (1) "First Efforts as Voluntary Cooperation, and the Strayer Report on the Needs of California Higher Education" (1945-1948); (2) "Voluntary Coordination of Growth, and the McConnell Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education" (1949-1955); (3) "Growth and Expansion, and the Semans-Holy Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California" (1956-1958); (4) "Structural Differentiation, Representative Coordination, and the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975" Interdisciplinary Research (Western Germany), the University of Sussex, the University of Legislative Committee on Higher Education" (1965-1969); (6) "From Representative to Advisory Coordination Through the Work of the Select Committee and Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan" (1970-1973); and (7)"Continuous Planning and Coordination Through the Five-Year Plans of the California Postsecondary Education Commission" (1974-1984). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260874
Item 225

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

California Postsecondary Educ Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

A REVIEW OF STATEWIDE LONG-RANGE PLANNING

One in a Series of Background Papers
for the Commission's Long-Range Planning Project,
A PROSPECTUS FOR CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
1985-2000

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Commission Report 84-17

Adopted April 30, 1984

This report is being issued in this format awaiting completion of the other background papers for the Commission's long-range planning project, at which time all of the papers may be issued in one volume.

CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
1945-1948:	First Efforts at Voluntary Cooperation, and the Strayer Report on the Needs of California in Higher Education	5
1949-1955:	Voluntary Coordination of Growth, and the McConnell Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education	9
1956-1958:	Growth and Expansion, and the Semans-Holy Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California	11
1959-1964:	Structural Differentiation, Representative Coordination, and The Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975	13
1965-1969:	A Legislative Look at Restructuring by The Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education	17
1970-1973:	From Representative to Advisory Coordination Through the Work of the Select Committee and Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan	21
1974-1984:	Continuous Planning and Coordination Through the Five-Year Plans of the California Postsecondary Education Commission	25
CONCLUSION		29
APPENDIX:	Chronology of the Creation of California Colleges and Universities	31
REFERENCES		41

INTRODUCTION

This is one of four background papers that form the base of the Commission's long-range planning project, "A Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education: 1985-2000." The three subsequent papers will be: (1) Social and Economic Trends: 1985-2000 -- an analysis of national and international societal trends that will affect California and its system of postsecondary education in coming decades; (2) Population and Enrollment Trends: 1985-2000 -- a compilation of empirical demographic data leading to the development of enrollment forecasting models; and (3) Financial Support for California Postsecondary Education: 1985-2000 -- an assessment of the outlook for the State's economy, for income to the State, and for financial support of postsecondary education over the next 15 years.

This initial background paper seeks to provide historical context for the Commission's analyses in these other papers and its identification of policy issues likely to confront California postsecondary education during the next 15 years. The primary vehicles for setting this context are seven major planning documents generated over the past 39 years under the auspices of four separate groups: (1) the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, from 1945 to 1960; (2) the Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education (1967 to 1969); the Select Committee on the Master Plan of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (1971 to 1972); and (4) the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan (1971 to 1973).

For California postsecondary education, these nearly four decades since 1945 have been characterized by expansion and development -- the expansion of enrollments, institutions, and systems, and the development of new programs, functions, and services. (The Appendix shows the dates of establishment for regionally accredited California institutions.) During this same period, statewide mechanisms for coordinating the expansion of institutions and segments and for avoiding duplication of services have evolved from a loose voluntary structure with no staff -- the early Liaison Committee -- through a representative council with assigned staff -- the early Coordinating Council for Higher Education -- to the present citizen commission with legislatively assigned advisory powers and specific functions -- the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The seven major statewide long-range planning studies of this period can most naturally be divided into two sets: the four conducted in 1947-48, 1954-55, 1957, and 1959 by or for the Liaison Committee, culminating in A Master Plan for California Higher Education: 1960-1975; and the later three of the joint legislative committees and the Select Committee of the Coordinating Council. The table on pages 2-4 compares all seven in terms of their authority, scope, and recommendations. The later sections of this paper describe their origins, methods, and conclusions, as well as illustrate the relationship among all seven, between the first four and the latter three, and between all seven of them and the subsequent master planning conducted since 1974 by the Postsecondary Education Commission.

The specific problems that motivated the seven efforts were, of course, unique to each of them, but as the following pages will seek to show, their persistent concern with a small core of issues over the entire period is striking. Indeed, the overriding concern of all of them can be said to be the continuing issue of statewide and segmental coordination among institutions in order to avoid wasteful competition and unnecessary duplication of effort or resources.

STATEWIDE LONG-RANGE PLANNING REPORTS IN CALIFORNIA, 1948-1973

Title	Group	Date	Authority	Scope	Major Recommendations
A Report on a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (The Strayer Report)	The Liaison Committee (Regents and State Board of Education)	March 1, 1948	"An act was passed at the 1947 session of the Legislature providing for a study of the present and future needs of California for education above the high school with particular reference to each area of the State." (preface)	1. An evaluation of the current and future needs of the State of California for education beyond the 12th grade of high school. 2. An analysis of the needs of each area of the State for higher educational facilities with special reference to emergency needs such as those in Los Angeles and Sacramento areas. 3. An analysis of the needs for varying types of publicly supported higher institutions. 4. Consideration of desirable changes in the organization of publicly supported higher education. 5. An examination of the manner of support of public higher education in the State.	1. No upper division work in the junior colleges. 2. University to have exclusive jurisdiction over doctoral programs. 3. The Liaison Committee to continue as the coordinating body. 4. New state colleges in Sacramento, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties.
A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education (The McConnell Report)	The Liaison Committee (The Joint Staff)	February 7, 1955	Budget Item 109.5, 1953 Regular Session of the California State Legislature	1. Potential enrollment in publicly supported institutions of higher education and independently controlled colleges and universities by 1955, 1960, and 1965, together with the necessary physical facilities to care for those expected enrollment increases. 2. The functions, organization, and educational programs of the junior colleges, the state colleges, the University of California and the independent institutions, with particular reference to such differentiation of function as seems appropriate among the three types of publicly supported institutions. 3. The government and administration of public higher education, with particular reference to coordination of the educational programs in all types of institutions and to economy in carrying out an over-all plan for the State. 4. The expenditures in higher education for various types and levels of educational services in the four groups of institutions included in the study. 5. The financial ability of the State of California to support its governmental activities, including higher education.	1. Expansion of junior college roles in lower division and vocational instruction. 2. Authorization for the state colleges to award the masters degree. 3. Tightening of admission standards for the University and the state colleges. 4. Establishment of a separate state college board. 5. Expansion and strengthening of the Liaison Committee as a coordinating body.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEWIDE LONG-RANGE PLANNING REPORTS IN CALIFORNIA, 1948-1973 (continued)

Title	Group	Date	Authority	Scope	Major Recommendations
A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California	The Liaison Committee	December, 1956	Self-initiated	1. To develop a priority for areas of the state now inadequately served by junior colleges, State Colleges, and campuses of the University of California. 2. To show the effect which the establishment of new institutions would have on existing ones.	1. New institutions will be needed if access is to be assured. 2. New campuses should not retard the operation and development of existing State College and University and University campuses in fast-growing metropolitan areas. 3. Community college services must be provided before a state college or university campus is established in an area. 4. Encourage general creation of junior colleges. 5. Consider alternatives to new campuses in accommodating enrollment growth. 6. Constant review of enrollment estimates is needed.
A Master Plan for Higher Education in California: 1960-1975 (The Master Plan)	The Liaison Committee (The Master Plan Survey Team)	January 29, 1960	ACR 88 (1959) directed the Liaison Committee "...to prepare a Master Plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education, in junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of higher education of the State, to meet the needs of the State during the next ten years and thereafter..."	1. The size of enrollments in higher education in California by 1975, and the distribution among the State's junior colleges, private colleges, and the University of California. 2. The appropriate differentiation of functions among the junior colleges, State colleges, and the University of California in light of present and prospective circumstances. 3. The priority list and time schedule for establishing new University and state college campuses. 4. The estimated cost to the State for public higher education in the decade ahead. 5. California's ability to pay for the future development of public higher education in the State. 6. The organization, control, and administration of publicly supported higher education in California.	1. Differentiation of functions (doctoral instruction, professional education, and research). 2. Stratification of admissions (1/2 and 1/8) and universal access. 3. All territory of the State to be included in a junior college district (areas not included to be required to contribute to support). 4. Institutions may not change from one type to another. 5. Establishment of the Coordinating Council.
The Challenge of Achievement (a staff report)	The Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California State Legislature	December, 1968	ACR 156 (1965) ACR 56 (1966) ACR 16 (1967)	"to ascertain, study, and analyze all the facts relating to the development to higher education under the Master Plan, to explore the future needs of higher education in California and to report any recommendations for if any, in existing law."	1. Consolidation of UC, CSUC, and CCC under a single governing board with a coordinating and administrative body for each major region. 2. Consideration of expansion of eligibility limits to for UC and CSUC, respectively. 3. Revision of the State Constitution to permit State aid to non-sectarian programs at private colleges and universities. 4. Reaffirmation of legislative opposition to tuition.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEWIDE LONG-RANGE PLANNING REPORTS IN CALIFORNIA, 1948-1973 (continued)

Title	Group	Date	Authority	Scope	Major Recommendations
The California Master Plan for Higher Education in the Seventies and Beyond (The Select Committee's Report)	Coordinating Council for Higher Education (The Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education)	November, 1972	Coordinating Council Resolution (January, 1972) ACR 166 (1971)	"to present recommendations as advice for broad policy direction that are more significantly related to philosophical and public-policy assumptions and goals than to quantitative data."	1. Confirmation of the basic structure of higher education as outlined in the 1960 Master Plan. 2. Changes in the composition, functions, authority, and name of the Coordinating Council. 3. Regional consortia to coordinate and administer policies. 4. Increase in State share of community college support to 50 percent. 5. Coordinating Council to be the 1202 agency. Also responded to questions in ACR 166: a. Should standards be set the size of campuses? b. Should traditional campuses continue to be the primary higher education delivery system? c. Should the role of the community colleges be expanded to include three-year programs in vocational and technical fields? d. What will be the future demands and needs for graduate and professional education at all levels? e. Should a permanent mechanism be established to review ... existing and proposed plans and programs?
Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education	The Legislature (Joint Committee on the Master Plan)	September, 1973	ACR 198 (1970)	Concerned with the present and future of postsecondary education: its purposes and objectives, its structure and governance, and the need for coordination and planning.	1. Replaced the Coordinating Council with the Postsecondary Education Commission. 2. Reaffirmed eligibility standards but expanded special admits. 3. Student affirmative action goals for public segments (as in ACR 151, 1974). 4. Regional councils to promote interinstitutional cooperation and regional planning. 5. A fourth public segment for nontraditional education. 6. Expansion of State student financial aid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1945-1948: FIRST EFFORTS AT VOLUNTARY COOPERATION, AND THE STRAYER REPORT ON THE NEEDS OF CALIFORNIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education was established in 1945 in a spirit of voluntary cooperation. At that time, the University of California consisted of only four major campuses -- Berkeley, Los Angeles, Davis, and Santa Barbara; while the State Board of Education had authority over the seven state colleges in Arcata, Chico, Fresno, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, and San Luis Obispo, as well as loose responsibility for 55 public "junior colleges" of varying size and scope that were governed by local boards, the oldest dating back to 1910.

Two years after the Liaison Committee was established, the Legislature adopted and Governor Warren signed Assembly Bill 2273 (1947), which authorized the two boards to undertake a joint survey of the needs of California in higher education and directed that they make recommendations to the Legislature at its 1948 session. The Liaison Committee commissioned George D. Strayer of Teachers College, Columbia University, to conduct the survey based on his record of conducting similar studies in other states. He was joined by Monroe E. Deutsch, Vice-President emeritus of the University, and Aubrey A. Douglass, Associate State Superintendent of Public Instruction, as members of the study committee.

Assembly Bill 2273 clearly spelled out the five tasks of the survey:

1. An evaluation of the current and future needs of the State of California for education beyond the 12th grade of high school.

2. An analysis of the needs of each area of the State for higher educational facilities with special reference to emergency needs such as those in the Los Angeles and Sacramento areas.

3. An analysis of the needs of varying types of publicly supported higher institutions.

4. Consideration of desirable changes in the organization of publicly supported higher education.

5. An examination of the manner of support of public higher education in the State.

Among the reasons for the survey was the large increase in enrollments following World War II, fueled by veterans benefits under the G.I. Bill. In October 1947, the University of California enrolled a total of 42,667 students; the state colleges, 19,281; the public junior colleges, 60,346; and independent institutions, 40,425 -- for a total of 162,719 students.* As Strayer,

*Although independent colleges and universities accounted for 29 percent of California's total college enrollment and more than that of the state colleges, the focus of the study on public education meant that these institutions were not represented on Strayer's study team and were virtually neglected in the report.

Deutsch, and Douglass noted (1948, p. 58):

> At the present moment the veterans in the higher educational system distort the size of the college population by adding a large number of veterans who will attend school up to 1956, the year in which federal provision for educational benefits for veterans expires . . . . If the predictions for 1948-49 and 1949-50 prove to be substantiated, between 125,000 and 130,000 veterans will be enrolled in California's higher education institutions in those years . . . .

A second reason beyond this temporary influx of veterans was the recommendation of the 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education for a doubling by 1960 of the percentage of youth provided a collegiate education or professional training. However, the major reason for the study (judging from the space devoted to the issue in Strayer's report) was the problem of coordination and differentiation of function between the local junior colleges and the state colleges. Several bills had been introduced in the Legislature calling for the conversion of some junior colleges into baccalaureate institutions, and in addressing this immediate issue, Strayer and his colleagues recommended a differentiation of function, limiting the junior colleges to two-year curricula and eliminating two-year curricula from the state colleges, while allowing the state colleges to grant master's degrees in teaching, which the Legislature subsequently authorized in 1949.

In projecting the need for higher education, the Strayer committee relied on the preliminary estimates of the State Office of Planning and Research regarding numbers of 18- to 24-year-olds in each of ten areas of the State. They pointed out that the simple upsurge of numbers resulting from the high birth rates of the 1940s would increase college enrollments sharply after 1960. In addition, they predicted an increase in college participation, "based upon such factors as the steady rise in college attendance between the two great wars, the provision of higher education in local institutions (notably the junior colleges), a greater acceptance of the value of higher education, and the subsidizing of worthy students by the State or Nation" (p. 57).

Strayer argued against continued growth of existing institutions, but consistent with the estimates of enrollment growth, he and his associates calculated the need for expanded facilities in the three public segments to be four new junior colleges by 1960, two new state colleges in Sacramento and Los Angeles, and expansion of the research and extension functions of the University's Riverside citrus research unit into undergraduate and graduate education. Their assessment of the State's ability to support these expansions concludes with the observation that only 2 percent of the State's income was used in the prior year to finance its entire educational program from kindergarten through graduate work of the University (p. 132).

With regard to control and administration of the state colleges, the Strayer committee recommended expansion of the two-person staff in the State Department of Education responsible for them. For the junior colleges, they endorsed as the ideal administrative organization unified school districts in which the schools from kindergarten through twelfth grade and the junior colleges were all administered by a single board of education and a common executive staff. For coordinating the several types of public institutions,

they advocated continuation of the Liaison Committee and provision by the State of $50,000 per year for it to secure "professional and technical staff."

In reviewing the impact of the Strayer committee report two decades later, Arthur Coons -- president of Occidental College and chairman of the 1960 Master Plan Survey Team -- called it "a reasonably comprehensive study" that "had considerable impact on educational opinion but received only limited legislative support" (1968, p. 28). But the Legislature authorized new state colleges at Long Beach, Los Angeles, Pomona, and Sacramento; and in 1951 it began appropriations to provide the professional and technical staff for the Liaison Committee that Strayer had recommended.

1949-1955: VOLUNTARY COORDINATION OF GROWTH, AND THE McCONNELL RESTUDY OF THE NEEDS OF CALIFORNIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By 1953, the University of California had grown to six campuses with the expansion of its Riverside and San Francisco operations, the state colleges had expanded to 11, the public junior colleges numbered 60, and independent colleges and universities numbered 63. Full-time enrollment totaled 147,710 -- 32,700 for the University, 25,310 for the state colleges, 48,700 for the public junior colleges, and some 41,000 for independent institutions. Between 1945 and 1955, total full-time and part-time enrollment grew 31 percent, from 244,903 to 321,778.

In 1953, the Legislature, concerned with the increasing cost of higher education in California and wishing a study of curricula then being offered by the several segments, appropriated more than $100,000 to the Liaison Committee for a two-year resurvey.

In the summer of 1954, T. R. McConnell, former Chancellor of the University of Buffalo and later professor of higher education at Berkeley, was engaged to work with the Joint Staff of the Liaison Committee, consisting of Thomas C. Holy, representing the Regents, and Hubert H. Semans, representing the State Department of Education. In February 1955, they transmitted their resulting report -- the most comprehensive of all seven statewide studies, containing some 140 recommendations affecting both public and independent institutions. McConnell viewed the study as "a re-examination and extension of the Strayer Committee Report of 1948." It not only reaffirmed some of the recommendations of that report while modifying others; it recommended "that a comprehensive review of the entire field should be made in 1960" (McConnell, pp. 2, 6).

McConnell, Holy, and Semans estimated what they considered as "conservative" future public and private college enrollment potential by first applying historical grade progression ratios to current enrollments in grades K through 12 and beyond in order to determine the numbers expected to survive into college. They next broke these numbers down into public/private, type of public institution, undergraduate/graduate, and lower/upper division categories. Then they divided this potential enrollment among the 14 planning areas of the State and forecast full-time enrollment potential through Fall 1965 for individual institutions within these areas.

With regard to admissions practices, they noted that the University's freshman class represented the top fifth of high school graduates as measured by grades in academic subjects, and they recommended that the University experiment with supplemental standardized tests for admission. They also advocated specification of an achievement threshold for junior college students seeking to transfer to state colleges, and they proposed setting minimum standards for retention for students in junior colleges as a means of these students qualifying for State aid.

McConnell and his colleagues also endorsed the principle of specialization or differentiation of function proposed by the Strayer committee and explicitly

recommended "that the junior colleges continue to take particular responsibility for technical curriculums, the state colleges for occupational curriculums, and the University of California for graduate and professional education and research," (p. 210) with "technical" curriculums limited to one or two years in length and "occupational" to baccalaureate programs. They also recommended that the two senior public segments each be conceived, planned, and administered as integrated systems and not as a group of autonomous campuses, and that special functions be assigned to some campuses without expecting all campuses in the system eventually to assume these functions. In other words, each segment was not to be a set of identical elements but instead a differentiated system.

McConnell and his associates anticipated the 1960 Master Plan in a number of recommendations dealing with growth as well as differentiation of function:

1. that the University and the state colleges reduce lower division enrollments in relation to those of their upper and graduate divisions;

2. that new Community Colleges be established in underserved populous areas with adequate resources;

3. that no new state colleges and no new campuses of the University be established before 1965, and that, in contrast to Strayer's recommendation of small campuses, the enrollment ceilings for existing campuses be removed;

4. that the state colleges be authorized to award master's degrees not only in teaching but also the master's of arts and science in other selected occupational fields where departments met required standards; and

5. that doctoral degrees in public institutions be awarded exclusively by the University of California at least until 1965.

Moreover, they recommended creating and staffing a "Bureau of Junior College Education" in the State Department of Education and a separate governing board for the state colleges (p. 285):

> It is recommended that within the public school system a new nine member lay board for the government of the state colleges, coordinate in structure of State government with the State Board of Education, be created. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should be a member ex officio . . . . Because the state colleges should be administered as a system, it is not recommended that each college be represented on the board.

Finally, in calling for a further comprehensive review of California higher education in 1960, McConnell and the Joint Staff set the stage and provided the analytical basis for the work of the Master Plan Survey Team.

1956-1958: GROWTH AND EXPANSION, AND THE SEMANS-HOLY STUDY OF THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL CENTERS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

In 1955, bills and amendments introduced in the Legislature would have established 19 new state colleges beyond the existing ten. Subsequent years saw increased pressure for such colleges, not only because of local prestige but also because of local cost, since State support for community colleges was but a small fraction of their total support. Moreover, by 1957, the earlier forecasts of enrollment growth were being revised extensively upward, on the basis of revised estimates of the size of high school graduating classes. An important immediate precedent for the 1960 Master Plan was the 1957 report by the two members of the Joint Staff of the Liaison Committee, Hubert H. Semans and Thomas C. Holy, A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California. In their report, Semans and Holy abandoned the Restudy's moratorium on new senior institutions, replacing it with a set of six principles to control the expansion of higher education (pp.v-vi):

1. The expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new ones should depend on the optimum use of the state's resources for higher education in relation to the greatest relative need both geographically and functionally.

2. Differentiation of functions so far as possible of the three segments of public higher education, namely the junior colleges, the state colleges, and the University of California, is imperative if unnecessary and wasteful duplication is to be avoided. This principle has been confirmed by the approval of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California of the recommendation in the Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education which reads as follows:

   > ". . . that the junior colleges continue to take particular responsibility for technical curriculums, the state colleges for occupational curriculums, and the University of California for graduate and professional education and research."

3. The assumption that adequate junior college facilities will be provided through local initiative and state assistance prior to the establishment of additional state college or University campuses is basic to the state college and University enrollment estimates in this report.

4. The financing of new publicly supported institutions should be such that it interferes in no way with the needs, including necessary improvement or expansion, of existing ones.

5. In order that a possible new institution may serve the greatest number of eligible students, it should be placed near the center of the population served by it.

6. Extension of publicly supported institutions to the degree that the continued operation of private ones long in existence and seemingly serving the community well is jeopardized, is not in the public interest.

These principles codified the intent of the earlier, more comprehensive studies sponsored by the Liaison Committee, and they proved to have considerable influence in restraining precipitous creation of more institutions (Coons, 1968, p. 28).

1959-1964: STRUCTURAL DIFFERENTIATION, REPRESENTATIVE COORDINATION, AND THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA, 1960-1975

In the ten years between 1950 and 1960, total enrollment in higher education had increased from 240,000 to 497,000. By 1960, eight of the nine University of California campuses were in existence. Fourteen state colleges were operating, with two more authorized. Some 60 public community colleges existed.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 88, authored by Dorothy M. Donahoe and approved by the 1959 Legislature, directed the Liaison Committee "to prepare a Master Plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education, in junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of higher education of the State, to meet the needs of the State during the next 10 years and thereafter . . . ."

Whereas the Strayer committee study and the McConnell restudy had been headed by consultants retained from outside California, this study was to be staffed by a "Master Plan Survey Team" constituted entirely of representatives of the several segments and the Legislature, with Arthur G. Coons, president of Occidental College, serving as chair. Besides Coons, the Survey Team consisted of eight members -- two representing the state colleges, two from the junior colleges, and one from private higher education. Keith Sexton served as consultant to the team and provided important liaison with the Legislature.

As President Coons later observed (1968, pp. 3, 24):

> California's development of a Master Plan for Higher Education in 1959-60 was a direct resultant of the unsolved problems of rivalry, tension, and struggle over several decades among the three public segments of higher education and also among and between them all the private or independent segment.
>
> . . . essentially the mandate derived from a legislative belief that the conflict among public institutions of higher education had got out of hand and required a long, hard and steady look in search of reasonable solution and economy to the taxpayers.

The Master Plan Survey Team did not start from scratch on its eight-month task. According to Coons, it "built on the edifice of fact, analysis, and principles in previous studies plus new data, as well as upon new unprecedented agreements among the several segments as to policies for the future" (p. 28). In conducting its survey, the team conferred with members of the Joint Advisory Committee to the Joint Staff of the Liaison Committee, which had been established in December 1958 and which consisted of representatives of the four segments; and it relied for data on six technical committees from the segments and State government agencies. The topics that the Survey Team addressed can be divided into six categories:

1. structure, function, and coordination, including establishment and role of the segments and a new coordinating agency;

2. selection and retention of students, covering entrance requirements, admissions policies and procedures, and distribution of lower division students;

3. institutional capacities and area needs, involving utilization of physical plants, enrollment limitiations, and projections;

4. faculty demand and supply, including the production of doctorates by California universities;

5. adult education, addressing responsibilities for coordination and State support; and

6. estimated costs, involving junior college support and student fees.

The Survey Team itself concentrated its efforts and deliberations on the first of these six concerns -- structure, function, and coordination -- and delegated the other five to its technical committees (Knorr, 1970, p. 5). Significantly, only recommendations dealing with the first area of concern were subsequently enacted into law by the Donahoe Act.

In discussing the study afterwards, Coons recalled the many differing candidates for "the basic principle" of the Master Plan, including (1) differentiation of function between and among the several public segments of higher education; (2) selective admissions for the several segments; (3) "tuition-free" public higher education; (4) "open door" admissions; (5) diversion of students to community colleges; (6) abatement of intersegmental and regional conflict; and (7) cost containment for the State (1968, p. 48). From his perspective, the "interrelationship between structure, function, and coordination" was the essential factor on which the Survey Team erected its plan and differentiated programs.

The report of the Master Plan Survey Team to the Liaison Committee, containing 67 wide-ranging recommendations, has been characterized as "nothing more than a peace treaty which permitted the respective systems to stake out their functional territories" (Knorr, 1970, p. 10) and "a statement of mutual demands . . ., a record of negotiated compromises . . ., and a ratification of the status quo" (Evans, 1968, p. 4). Admittedly, it contained something for everyone:

1. It recognized the junior colleges as part of public higher education, although it left their "general supervision" to the State Board of Education. It defined their functions as (1) transfer courses, (2) vocational-technical fields, and (3) general or liberal arts courses; and it advocated their admitting "all those who can benefit from instruction."

2. It proposed creating a separate "Board of Trustees" for the "State College System of California," assigning the system the responsibility for "instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional and applied fields which require more than two years of collegiate

education, and teacher education, both for undergraduate students and graduate students through the masters degree," and granting it authority to award joint doctoral degrees in cooperation with the University of California. It also advocated limiting freshman admission to the system to those from the upper one-third of the high school graduating class.

3. The University was to "provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education" and have exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over training for the professions "(including but not by way of limitation) dentistry, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and graduate architecture" (the latter being later excepted), sole authority in public higher education to award doctoral degrees in all fields of learning, with the exception of joint doctoral degrees, and primary responsibility for research. It was to limit freshman admission to the top one-eighth of high school graduates.

The Master Plan represented a remarkably effective broad blueprint for the growth and coordination of higher education in California, as well as the foremost exemplar nationally as well as internationally of statewide master planning. While the impetus and the emphasis for the plan may have been the need to resolve the respective roles of the senior public segments, the diversion of lower division students to the junior colleges (with the goal of the 60/40 ratio of upper to lower division students in the senior segments by 1975) assumed the maintenance of high quality transfer curricula in these colleges and the need for ongoing articulation between the junior colleges and public and private four-year institutions. Beyond this, the broadness of the blueprint itself made necessary some provision for ongoing coordination of the systems. Thus the Survey Team recommended a 12-member advisory body consisting of three representatives -- the chief executive officer and two board members -- from each of the public segments and a like number from independent institutions.

In implementing many of the plan's recommendations through the Donahoe Act of 1960, the Legislature added three representatives of the public at large to this Coordinating Council for a total of 15 members. But the Legislature did not agree to the Survey Team's recommendation to implement major provisions of the plan through a constitutional amendment, and other provisions were simply accepted in principle by the Liaison Committee, which ceased to meet after the creation in 1960 of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

1965-1969: A LEGISLATIVE LOOK AT RESTRUCTURING BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

By Fall 1966, the University had grown to its present nine campuses with the addition of Santa Cruz, and it had a total headcount enrollment of 82,585 full-time students. The 18 State Colleges enrolled 110,274 such students. The 77 Community Colleges had full-time enrollments of 198,135 and total headcount enrollments of 487,458. The Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, which had been organized in 1955, comprised 48 institutions enrolling 62,447 full-time students. Total enrollment had grown 245 percent from 240,000 in Fall 1950 to 827,000. By 1967, the Community Colleges' Board of Governors was created, and overall supervision of the colleges was removed from the Department of Education.

In 1965, against the backdrop of student free-speech demonstrations, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 156, establishing a Joint Committee on Higher Education of the Senate and the Assembly to "ascertain, study, and analyze all the facts relating to the development of higher education under the Master Plan, to explore the future needs of higher education in California, and to report any recommendations for new legislation and changes, if any, in existing law" (Evans, 1969, p. 111).

The chair of the Committee, Speaker of the Assembly Jesse M. Unruh, described its proposed effort as "an exhaustive, two-year study of California's university and state college problems." While admitting the influence of the "Berkeley riots" on the Legislature's action in creating the Committee, he disavowed any intention of investigating Berkeley alone. Instead, the Committee's inquiry was to include all University campuses, the State Colleges, the Community Colleges, and the entire Master Plan (Coons, 1968, p. 216).

The Joint Committee's staff of three was headed by a consultant, Jerome Evans, a former member of the staff of the Legislative Analyst, but much of its work was performed by contractors and subcontractors, under a $350,000 budget deemed adequate to develop "a meaningful revision of the Master Plan that would have a good chance of legislative passage" (Unruh, 1967).

Although the Joint Committee's final report was not due until 1969, in 1967 the Legislature directed the committee through Assembly Concurrent Resolution 16 to report to the 1968 Session on the question of "tuition" for California's public colleges and universities. This directive resulted in an interim report, The Academic State, containing recommendations and dissenting statements on tuition as well as the general scope and character of California higher education and several preliminary findings concerning high school and college attrition, aid to independent institutions, and the structure of higher education:

- Regarding attrition, it advocated better understanding of the dimensions of the problem in identifying the characteristics and motivations of dropouts.

- Regarding aid to independent institutions, it explored arguments for and against amending California's Constitution to allow direct institutional

aid to them over and above their tax-exempt status and award of state scholarships to their students, begun in 1956.

- Regarding the organization of higher education, it posed alternatives to the existing structure of the four statewide segments in order to "increase the flexibility of educational planning" (Joint Committee on Higher Education, 1968, p. xi). These included strengthening of existing coordinating machinery, creation of a new comprehensive governing board, and consolidation of all three public systems under it.

- Finally, regarding tuition, it presented seven findings leading to a recommendation against it (p. ix):

> the Committee finds that under present circumstances the arguments offered for tuition are of insufficient relevance and merit to justify a departure from the state's historic policy regarding tuition. Accordingly, the Committee opposes the imposition of tuition for 1968-1969 and any comparably large increases in student fees for the same purpose.

The Joint Committee transmitted its final report, The Challenge of Achievement, (including dissenting statements from several members of the Committee) to the 1969 Regular Session as "a staff report prepared for the Committee." In it, the staff recommended two major actions -- (1) "a thorough reorganization of public higher education, with the objective not only of strengthening statewide and regional planning and coordination, but also to focus greater responsibility at the campus level for the management of each institution," and (2) new programs and practices "to sharply increase the opportunity for students from all ethnic groups to gain a college education" (Evans, p. xi).

Its proposed reorganization of public higher education would have combined the three existing governing boards into a single consolidated governing board, called The Board of Regents, for all public higher education in California. This board would have also absorbed the functions of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the State Scholarship and Loan Commission. Its responsibilities were to include (p. 56):

1. the formulation of broad statewide governing policies for the system;

2. short-range and long-range fiscal planning;

3. the allocation of state support for all public institutions of higher education;

4. long-range program planning;

5. periodic evaluation of the performance of the system in relation to educational policies;

6. central administration of student aid programs; and

7. appointment of the President of the University and the presidents of the four-year institutions.

Beneath this consolidated board, a coordinating and administrative body in each region in the state would focus the various resources of public higher education on the needs of the region and monitor implementation of statewide and regional policies.

The staff's recommendations for equal educational opportunity fell into two sets -- one dealing with special support services and financial aid for disadvantaged students, the second proposing expansion of special admission at public four-year institutions from 4 percent to 10 percent and adjustment of eligibility limits to 20 percent for the University and 40 percent for the State Colleges.

The Joint Committee's 1968 position on tuition prevailed; and special support services, financial aid, and admissions were later created or expanded in the direction of the staff's 1969 recommendations. But the connection between these recommendations and subsequent legislation remains unclear, and the rest of the Committee's work, including its reorganization proposals, was not acted upon by the Legislature.

1970-1973: FROM REPRESENTATIVE TO ADVISORY COORDINATION THROUGH THE SELECT COMMITTEE AND THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN

By 1970, the growth foreseen by the Liaison Committee had become reality. The 20 million residents of the State were double the population at the time of the Strayer committee report in 1948, but total enrollment of higher education had more than quadrupled -- from 240,000 to 1.1 million. Besides the nine University of California campuses, all of today's 19 State University campuses were in operation, following the creation of California State College, Bakersfield in 1965. All but one of today's 70 Community College districts were in existence, as were 91 Community Colleges.

The full-time enrollment of the University was over 100,000; that of the California State Colleges was nearly 200,000, and that of the Community Colleges was more than half a million. Their enrollment growth in the ten years since the Master Plan had been paralleled by unprecedented capital construction; the scale of the enterprise had changed to the point where the original Liaison Committee members hardly recognized it; and even its nature was shifting -- from a focus only on academic "higher" education to a concern with "postsecondary" education of all types.

The Master Plan had worked well for the first two-thirds of its allotted 15 years, but rivalry persisted and, according to Neal Smelser and Gabriel Almond (1974, p. 71), "the state colleges became, if anything, even more aggressive in their drive for parity with the university" -- as evidenced by disputes within the Coordinating Council over such issues as relative roles for the two segments in extension courses, and relative levels of faculty salary adjustments. In 1967, the Board of Trustees had passed a resolution calling for inclusion of the State College system in the Constitution, including explicit unilateral authority for it to award doctoral degrees approved by the Coordinating Council; but although the Constitutional Revision Commission of 1970 concurred, the necessary constitutional amendment was never enacted.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN

After May 1970, campus riots were history, but because of them and the changing demographic character of California's population, the decade of the '70s opened with much uncertainty as to continued growth and public support for postsecondary education. Thus it was that the Coordinating Council, after conducting two years of topical studies as a base for reexamining of the Master Plan, announced in July 1971 the appointment of a 17-member "Select Committee on the Master Plan," consisting primarily of lay public members and chaired by Joseph B. Platt, president of Harvey Mudd College.

The Coordinating Council's motivation for creating the Select Committee included "a number of factors and forces with impacts on higher education that were not completely foreseen in 1959 and 1960" (Select Committee, 1972, p. iv) -- among them being:

1. increasing participation of the federal government in the financing of higher education;

2. increased strength of the State Colleges;

3. changes in the traditional functions of the faculty in governance and, in particular, the emergence of faculty bargaining organizations beyond the faculty senates;

4. increasing demands for student participation in policies affecting them;

5. insufficient financial support to meet rising enrollments and costs; and

6. concern for disadvantaged young people.

The Council's charge to the Select Committee required "a review of the nature and application of the 1960 Master Plan and of the conditions forecast for the 1970s in order to advise the Coordinating Council whether the current Master Plan should be maintained intact, revised, or replaced" (Select Committee, 1972, p. v).

The committee was not asked by the Coordinating Council to produce a new master plan document, and it did not do so. Instead, it relied for its quantitative analyses on the Coordinating Council's earlier topical studies, and in its final report to the Coordinating Council of November 1972, it focused on policy recommendations that reaffirmed the structure of higher education defined in the Master Plan and rejected the consolidated-board concept of the earlier Joint Legislative Committee staff.

Nonetheless, the Select Committee recommended renaming the Coordinating Council, expanding its representation, and emphasizing its planning function, and it called on the Council to prepare a revised and updated Master Plan document. But because its work had increasingly been paralleled by that of the concurrent Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan, these and other proposals were carried over into those of the Joint Committee.

THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN

In September 1970, Assembly Concurrent Resolution 198 had created the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan explicitly to reassess the Master Plan, nominally due to expire in 1975. This was done in the context of mounting dissatisfaction with the authority, the functions, and the operations of the Coordinating Council, leading to deletion by the Assembly Ways and Means Committee of the Council's funding (later restored) from the 1970-71 Budget. The Joint Legislative Committee, chaired by Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, with Senator Howard Way as vice chair, began work in March 1971. It commissioned a dozen reports from independent consultants on specific topics, including people's views of desirable goals for higher education (Peterson, 1973), graduate education and research (Mayhew, 1973), alternative forms of higher education (Martin, 1973), and Asian, Chicano,

and Black students (Yoshioka, 1973; Lopez and Enos, 1973; and Nairobi Research Institute, 1973). Its three-person staff was then responsible for preparing the final Committee report.

The report, submitted to the Legislature in September 1973, was not motivated by any discernible crisis. Rather it was the deliberate result of two years of study, intensive discussion, and public testimony, and as such was unusual in a legislative environment dominated by immediacy.

In its report, the Committee disavowed any intent either to indict or canonize the Master Plan. Its first and foremost recommendation embodied a statement of broad goals for California postsecondary education on which the rest of the document relies (p. 2):

A. Academic freedom and responsibility;

B. Equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages and geographies;

C. Lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit;

D. Diversity of institutions, services and methods;

E. Flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society;

F. Cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources, and meeting those needs;

G. Involvement with local communities in providing educational services and utilizing community resources in the educational process;

H. Increased understanding of the learning process -- to be sought and applied throughout higher education;

I. Discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning; research and teaching;

J. Accountability throughout postsecondary education including:

1. accountability of institutions to the individual (for instruction and related services),

2. accountability of institutions to the public and its representatives,

3. accountability of the individual (faculty, student, staff) to the institutions, and

4. accountability of the public and its leaders to the institutions (for support and development).

Like the Select Committee, it rejected the consolidated-board proposal of the 1967-69 Joint Committee staff and concluded that structural reorganization was neither necessary nor sufficient for the achievement of those educational goals. Instead, it explicitly advocated retaining the existing segmental structure.

In addition, the Committee reaffirmed the continued stratification of admission standards and differentiation of functions among segments and among campuses of the four-year segments, calling for mission statements more specific than "general campus" and "statewide program." It also endorsed extension of joint doctoral authority between the state colleges and accredited independent institutions. Through a series of Assembly Concurrent Resolutions in 1973, it established equal educational opportunity goals and other policies that have figured prominently in California postsecondary education in the intervening decade.

The Committee recommended that the State establish a "fourth segment of California public postsecondary education" separate from the University, State University, and Community Colleges to offer instruction, coordinate existing off-campus and "non-traditional" programs, assess learning experiences, maintain a "credit bank" to assist transfer of credit, and award certificates and degrees. In 1976, the Legislature rejected this idea, but by then the Committee had achieved its major organizational result, implemented through Assembly Bill 770 (1973): replacement of the Coordinating Council with a new coordinating body -- The California Postsecondary Education Commission. The next section of this report traces the development of this new coordinating body.

1974-1984: CONTINUOUS PLANNING AND COORDINATION THROUGH FIVE-YEAR PLANS OF THE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

By Fall 1973, 98 of today's 106 Community Colleges were in operation. The number of independent and private institutions had grown to 191, but they had not yet begun their rapid increase in numbers that stemmed from the "non-traditional education" movement of the mid-1970s. Over 1.4 million students were enrolled in credit courses -- 852,800 in the Community Colleges, 286,600 in the renamed "California State University and Colleges," 118,900 at the University of California, 1,800 in the State's other two public institutions -- the California Maritime Academy, and the Hastings College of the Law -- and 142,600 in independent and private institutions.

To coordinate planning for this expanded system, the Joint Committee on the Master Plan had recommended that:

> The "Master Plan" approach shall be replaced by a continuous planning process which includes:
>
> A. A legislative study of California postsecondary education at ten-year intervals to reevaluate the planning process and provide guidelines regarding goals, social needs, and general missions of public higher education and its components.
>
> B. Continuous planning by a state commission including a five-year plan which is to be updated annually (1973, p. 21).

Despite several changes in composition over its 14-year history, the Coordinating Council had remained dominated by its institutional representatives. The new Commission consisted of 12 public members and 11 institutional representatives -- two each from the Regents, the Trustees, the Board of Governors, and the independent institutions, plus the chair of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training, the chair of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions, and the president of the State Board of Education. These latter representatives were included to meet the intent of the federal Education Amendments of 1972 for statewide coordination of all "postsecondary education." In 1979, the public majority of the Commission was further enhanced when the membership of the Commission was reduced to 15, with nine public representatives and six board representatives.

Soon after the California Postsecondary Education Commission was created, its staff began preparation of its first five-year plan for the years 1976-81. The Commission adopted this plan in December 1975, stating that it "rests solidly on the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education," which "laid the foundation for the best educational system in the world" and "enabled both the public and private institutions to progress and expand in an orderly fashion."

Acknowledging that the era of expansion was ending, the Commission focused its attention on 11 other problems that required attention during 1976-1981. In terms of priority, it recommended these actions (1975, pp. 21-51).

Develop a series of comprehensive state-level systems of information collection, storage, retrieval, and dissemination which will facilitate the making of informed decisions about postsecondary education.

Determine the need for new services to part-time adult students and the best means for meeting this need.

Provide adequate funding for operating and capital needs of public postsecondary education and to employ the most effective methods for determining the adequacy of State funding for postsecondary education in California.

Encourage the participation of independent colleges and universities and private vocational institutions in the statewide planning process to insure the orderly development of postsecondary education in California.

Encourage regional interinstitutional or intersegmental cooperation which will facilitate and enhance the effective coordination and delivery of educational services.

Work toward the equitable participation of ethnic minorities and women in the admission and retention of postsecondary education students.

Assess the quality of academic and vocational programs, and the means used for establishing, maintaining, or improving such quality.

Insure that all persons have convenient access to educational and career counseling in order that they be encouraged to make informed choices from among all available options.

Develop and maintain an integrated statewide vocational education planning process involving all affected State agencies concerned with vocational education planning at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Work to eliminate financial barriers which prevent students from selecting and pursuing the educational program for which they are qualified.

Insure that in the process of collective bargaining, the operations and philosophy of postsecondary educational institutions be retained in the context of academic freedom and collegiality.

In updating this plan the following year, the Commission added seven more priorities -- (1) increasing equal educational opportunity; (2) encouraging lifelong learning; (3) reducing financial barriers to access; (4) assuring cooperation between the schools and postsecondary education on students' skill development; (5) assuring institutional flexibility despite stabilizing enrollments; (6) protecting the well-being of independent institutions; and (7) improving accreditation (1977, pp. 29-89).

In its 1978 update, the Commission admitted that it had "sought to limit further expansion of the number of issues to be worked on until a successful resolution of some of the current issues is achieved" (1978, p. 1). In its 1979 update, it assessed the progress that had been made in resolving a series of 29 issues and identified which of them were likely to continue into the 1980s. And in 1980, it published Issues in Planning for the Eighties -- a set of five staff papers on California postsecondary education, its environment, its students, faculty issues, and State and segmental planning, written in preparation for the next five-year plan.

In November 1981, the Commission issued its second five-year plan, The Challenges Ahead: A Planning Agenda for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-1987, which identified nine priorities for this half decade (pp. 15-23):

- improved planning and program review;
- improved student preparation and skills;
- protecting the integrity of degrees and other credentials;
- improving access for underrepresented groups;
- controlling financial barriers to access and choice;
- conserving the resources of independent education;
- assuring ethical recruitment and student choice;
- assuring financial support and effective management practices; and
- selective review of provisions of the Master Plan.

Over the years, the Commission's role in budget review has grown, and the number of legislative and executive requests for studies of specific issues has increased, but the development of a comprehensive strategy to assure orderly growth remains the primary task of the agency.

During 1982, the Commission directed its major planning efforts to a comprehensive study of student charges, student financial aid, and access to postsecondary education, in response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 81 (1982), as well as to the issue of remediation. And in 1983, it announced plans for its current long-range planning project, "A Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education, 1985-2000," which will identify issues that the State should be prepared to address not just over the next five years but over the next 15.

CONCLUSION

The seven long-range planning efforts that preceded the Postsecondary Education Commission's work can be compared in several ways:

- They vary in the nature and scope of their mandate. In each case, they were based on at least a legislative resolution, but in some instances this legislative authorization came after their work had begun.

- They vary in the extent to which they rely on outside consultants for the conduct of their research. The Strayer and McConnell studies largely predated the development of professional staff for the Liaison Committee, and the legislative studies of the 1960s and '70s were staffed by consultants engaged for the specific work of its joint committees. In contrast, both the Holy-Semans 1957 study of the need for additional centers and the 1960 Master Plan were conducted by staff involved in the segments, which may have accounted for some of the broad acceptance of their recommendations within the academic community.

- They vary in extent of legislative involvement, with the Strayer and McConnell reports directed more to the Liaison Committee than the Legislature, and with the legislative involvement increasing over the history of the Liaison Committee and becoming direct in the studies of the 1960s and '70s.

- And they vary in implementation of their recommendations into law, which -- despite legislative involvement -- was more often the exception rather than the rule. The Donahoe Act dealt with only a small fraction of the recommendations of the Survey Team -- most of which were proposed by the Liaison Committee for adoption through a constitutional amendment, although the University later withdrew its support for this mechanism; and the reports of the Joint Committees on Higher Education and the Master Plan proposed major structural changes in education and governance that were never implemented.

Despite this variation, they have focused on two recurring themes. One has been the continued State goals of access and excellence, involving the location, function, and differentiation of institutions, whether under pressures for rapid expansion or consolidation. The other has been the continual problem of coordinating these institutions.

This concern for coordination did not start with the creation of the Liaison Committee in 1945. In 1933, the Legislature established a nine-member state council for educational planning and coordination to render advice and make recommendations "for cooperative understanding and coordinated effort in the operation and articulation of the common school system and the university system . . ." (Paltridge, 1966, p. 21). The Council met periodically, but by 1941 it had ceased to meet. Significantly, the majority of its members consisted of lay citizens representing the general pubic -- a policy to which the State returned only in 1974 with the creation of the Postsecondary Education Commission.

The Liaison Committee, which provided coordination from 1945 to 1960, was composed of equal representation from the Board of Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, including the University's president and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; but it included no non-board representatives.

When the Master Plan Survey Team proposed a separate and autonomous governing board for the State Colleges, it was left with an obvious need for some coordinating mechanism beyond the existing Liaison Committee. Its answer was "an advisory coordinating council representative of all segments of higher education" (Paltridge, 1966, p. 30, underlining added).

Although the Donahoe Act of 1960 added three members of the public at large to the Coordinating Council, and three more representatives of the public at large were added in 1965, the Council remained institution dominated. The replacement of the Council with the Postsecondary Education Commission not only removed the chief executive officers of the segments as members, leaving governing board members as segmental representatives; it completed the trend of the 1960s toward public dominance by making public-at-large members the majority.

In sum, what began in 1945 as unstaffed voluntary consultation regarding planning and coordination between the public governing boards of higher education has grown over the intervening years into a statutorily mandated and professionally staffed public body advisory to the governing boards as well as to the Legislature and the Governor. However, the original intent of limiting the extent to which issues must be debated and resolved in the legislative arena is as pertinent today as it was in 1945 when the Strayer committee curtailed the ambitions of the two-year colleges to become four-year colleges, in 1955 when T.R. McConnell and his colleagues declared a moratorium on new senior institutions, in 1959 when Senator Donahoe called for a controlling Master Plan, and in 1974 when the Joint Legislative Committee reconstituted the coordinating body.

APPENDIX

Chronology of the Creation of California Colleges and Universities

The following pages list the years in which California's colleges and universities were established, according to information supplied by the institutions for the Commission's Guide to California Colleges and Universities, 1983. Included are all State-supported institutions and all independent institutions operating in California as accredited colleges or universities as of August 1982.

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1851					University of Santa Clara University of the Pacific, Stockton
1852					Mills College, Oakland
1855					University of San Francisco
1857		San Jose			
1861					Chapman College, Orange
1863					Saint Mary's College of California, Moraga
1864	San Francisco Medical Center				
1866					Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley
1868	Berkeley				College of Notre Dame, Belmont Holy Names College, Oakland
1871					American Baptist Seminary of the West, Berkeley San Francisco Art Institute San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo
1875					Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles
1878				Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco	
1880					University of Southern California, Los Angeles
1882					Pacific Union College, Angwin

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1883			Chaffey, Alta Loma		
1884					Woodbury University, Los Angeles
1885					School of Theology at Claremont Stanford University
1887		Chico			Cogswell College, San Francisco Occidental College, Los Angeles Pomona College, Claremont
1889					Dominican College of San Rafael
1891					California Institute of Technology, Pasadena University of La Verne
1893					Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley
1894					Saint Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park
1896					Humphreys College, Stockton
1897		San Diego			
1898					Saint Joseph's College, Mountain View
1899		San Francisco			Azusa Pacific University
1901		San Luis Obispo			Golden Gate University, San Francisco Whittier College
1902					Point Loma College, San Diego
1904					Southern California College of Optometry, Fullerton Starr King School for the Ministry, Berkeley
1905	Davis				Loma Linda University National Technical Schools, Los Angeles
1907					California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland University of Redlands

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1908			Santa Barbara		Biola University, La Mirada
1909					San Francisco Law School West Coast University, Los Angeles and San Diego
1910			Fresno		
1911		Fresno			Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles Los Angeles College of Chiropractic Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles Southwestern University School of Law, Los Angeles
1912	San Diego				
1913		Humboldt State	Bakersfield Fullerton		
1914			San Diego City Sierra, Rocklin		California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco
1915			Citrus, Azusa Santa Ana		
1916			Riverside Sacramento		
1917					Deep Springs San Francisco Conservatory of Music
1918			Santa Rosa		Armstrong College, Berkeley
1919	Los Angeles		Gavilan, Gilroy		Bethany Bible, Santa Cruz
1920			Allan Hancock, Santa Maria Hartnell, Salinas		Southern California College, Costa Mesa
1921			Modesto San Jose		Simpson, San Francisco
1922			San Mateo Imperial Valley Taft		
1924			Pasadena		

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1925			Los Angeles Trade-Technical Sequoias, Visalia Lassen, Susanville Ventura		Claremont Graduate School L.I.F.E. Bible College, Los Angeles Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles
1926			Marin, Kentfield San Bernardino Valley King's River, Reedley		Scripps College, Claremont
1927			Compton Glendale Long Beach Porterville Yuba, Marysville		Los Angeles Baptist College Menlo College, Atherton
1928					Pacific Christian College, Fullerton
1929			Antelope Valley, Lancaster Los Angeles Santa Monica	California Maritime Academy Vallejo	
1930					Art Center College of Design, Pasadena Queen of the Holy Rosary College, Mission San Jose San Francisco College of Mortuary Science
1931			West Hills, Coalinga		Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, Berkeley
1934			Mira Costa, Oceanside		Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
1935			City College of San Francisco		
1937					Pepperdine University, Malibu
1938		Pomona			

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1939					Center for Early Childhood Education, Los Angeles Saint John's College, Camarillo San Jose Bible College
1940			Napa Valley		Westmont College, Santa Barbara
1942					Northrop University, Inglewood
1944	Santa Barbara				Fresno Pacific College Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley
1945			East Los Angeles, Monterey Park Mount San Antonio, Walnut Solano, Suisun City		Brooks Institute, Santa Barbara Patten College, Oakland
1946			Palomar, San Marcos		Claremont McKenna College Holy Family College, Fremont
1947		Los Angeles Sacramento	El Camino, Via Torrance Los Angeles Pierce, Woodland Hills Monterey Peninsula Orange Coast, Costa Mesa Palo Verde, Blythe		Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena University of Judaism, Los Angeles
1948		Long Beach	Contra Costa, San Pablo Diablo Valley, Pleasant Hill Shasta, Redding		Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena
1949			Los Angeles Harbor, Wilmington Los Angeles Valley, Van Nuys		University of San Diego West Coast Christian University, Fresno

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1950					California Baptist College, Riverside Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley
1951		Consortium of the California State University			
1952					Columbia College-Hollywood Grantham College of Engineering, Los Angeles United States International University, San Diego
1953			Laney, Oakland Merritt, Oakland		
1954	Riverside				
1955			American River, Sacramento Cerritos, Norwalk		Don Bosco Technical Institute, Rosemead Harvey Mudd College, Claremont Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, Fresno Monterey Institute of International Studies
1957		Fullerton Hayward Stanislaus	Siskiyous, Weed		
1958		Northridge	Desert, Palm Desert Foothill, Los Altos Hills		Bay City College of Dental-Medical Assistants, San Francisco California Western School of Law, San Diego
1959			Barstow Cabrillo, Aptos		California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks
1960	Irvine	Dominguez Hills San Bernardino Sonoma State	Victor Valley, Victorville		

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1961			Chabot, Hayward Grossmont, El Cajon Southwestern, Chula Vista		Empire College School of Law, Santa Rosa
1962	Santa Cruz		Merced Mount San Jacinto Rio Hondo, Whittier San Diego Mesa		Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley The San Fernando Valley College of Law, Sepulveda
1963			Moorpark San Joaquin Delta, Stockton West Valley, Saratoga		Coleman College, La Mesa Pitzer College, Claremont West Coast University, Orange Campus
1964			Alameda Redwoods, Eureka Cuesta, San Luis Obispo		California Institute of the Arts, Valencia John F. Kennedy University, Orinda
1965		Bakersfield			
1966			Cypress Golden West, Huntington Beach		University of West Los Angeles School of Law, Culver City Western State University College of Law-Orange County, Fullerton Whittier College School of Law, Los Angeles
1967			Butte, Oroville De Anza, Cupertino Los Angeles Southwest Ohlone, Fremont Saddleback, Irvine and Mission Viejo		Glendale University College of Law Marymount Palos Verdes College, Rancho Palos Verdes
1968			Canada, Redwood City Columbia Feather River, Quincy		California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco Franciscan School of Theology, Berkeley

continued

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
			West Los Angeles, Culver City		St. John's Seminary, Camarillo The Wright Institute, Berkeley Thomas Aquinas College, Santa Paula
1969			Canyons, Valencia San Diego Miramar Skyline, San Bruno		California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego Lincoln Law School, Sacramento San Joaquin College of Law, Fresno The Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising, Los Angeles Ventura College of Law Western State University College of Law, San Diego
1970			Cosumnes River, Sacramento San Francisco Community College Centers		Rand Graduate Institute of Policy Studies, Santa Monica
1971			Indian Valley, Novato		Brooks College, Long Beach D-Q University, Davis National University, San Diego New College of California, San Francisco World College West, San Rafael
1972			Crafton Hills, Yucaipa		Christ College Irvine Southern California Institute of Architecture, Santa Monica
1973			Cerro Coso, Ridgecrest Los Medanos, Pittsburg Mendocino, Ukiah		Bay Valley Tech, Santa Clara California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno
1974			Vista, Berkeley		American Academy of Dramatic Arts, Pasadena Heald Institute of Technology, Santa Clara The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara

Year	University of California	California State University	California Community Colleges	Other Public Institutions	Independent Institutions
1975			Evergreen Valley, San Jose Lake Tahoe, South Lake Tahoe Los Angeles Mission, San Fernando Oxnard		College of Osteopathic Medicine of the Pacific, Pomona Santa Barbara College of Law
1976			Coastline, Fountain Valley		
1977			Mission, Santa Clara		College for Human Services-California, Oakland
1978			Cuyamaca, El Cajon		
1979					Otis Art Institute of Parsons School of Design, Los Angeles
1982					Monterey College of Law

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission, Guide to California Colleges and Universities, 1983. Commission Report 83-10. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1983, pp. 177-241.

REFERENCES

California Legislature. Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, 1973.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan, 1976-81. Commission Report 75-4. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1975.

--. Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1977-1982. Commission Report 77-1. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1977.

--. Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1978. Commission Report 78-1. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1978.

--. Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1979. Commission Report 78-18. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1978.

--. Issues in Planning for the Eighties. Commission Report 80-11. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1980.

--. The Challenges Ahead: A Planning Agenda for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-1987. Commission Report 81-26. Sacramento: The Commission, November 1981.

--. A Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education, 1985-2000. Commission Report 84-6. Sacramento: The Commission, January 1984.

Coons, Arthur S. Crises in California Higher Education, Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1968.

Evans, Jerome. The Challenge of Achievement, A Report to the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature, 1968.

Gerth, Donald R., and Haehn, J. O. An Invisible Giant. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Holy, Thomas C., and Semans, Hubert H. A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California, 1957.

Joint Committee on Higher Education. The Academic State: A Progress Report to the Legislature on Tuition and Other Matters Pertaining to Higher Education by the Joint Committee on Higher Education. Sacramento: California Legislature, 1968.

Knorr, Owen Albert. "Master Plan -- Reality or Myth?" Address to the Spring Articulation Conference, Sacramento, California, May 23, 1970.

Lopez, Ronald W., and Enos, Darryl D. Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California. Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

Master Plan Survey Team. Master Plan for Higher Education in California: 1960 to 1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

Mayhew, Lewis. Graduate Education in California and The Role of Research in California Higher Education. Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

McConnell, T. R.; Holy, Thomas C.; and Semans, Hubert H. A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education, 1955.

Nairobi Research Institute. Blacks and Public Higher Education in California. Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

Paltridge, James G. California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 Academic Communities. Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. The California Master Plan for Higher Education in the Seventies and Beyond: Report and Recommendations to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1972.

Smelser, Neil J., and Almond, Gabriel. Public Higher Education in California, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Stadtman, Verne A. The University of California 1868-1968. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Strayer, George D.; Deutsch, Monroe E.; and Douglass, Aubrey A. A Report on a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education, 1948.

Unruh, Jesse M. Press release, August 22, 1967, quoted by Arthur G. Coons, Crises in California Higher Education 1968, p. 216.

Yoshioka, Robert B. Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California. Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

A state agency created in 1974 to assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs through statewide planning and coordination.

MEMBERS

Representing the General Public:

Seth P. Brunner, Vice Chairperson	Sacramento
C. Thomas Dean	Long Beach
Seymour M. Farber, Chairperson	San Francisco
Patricia Gandara	Sacramento
Ralph J. Kaplan	Beverly Hills
Nancy McFadden	San Jose
Roger C. Pettitt	Los Angeles
Thomas E. Stang	Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale	Mokelumne Hill

Representing the Regents of the University of California:

Sheldon W. Andelson	Los Angeles

Representing the Trustees of The California State University:

Claudia H. Hampton	Los Angeles

Representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges:

Mario Camara	Los Angeles

Representing the Independent California Colleges and Universities:

Jean M. Leonard	San Mateo

Representing the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions:

Darlene M. Laval	Fresno

Representing the State Board of Education:

Sandra J. Boese	Merced

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES

Representing the Regents of the University of California:

Yvonne Brathwaite Burke	Los Angeles

Representing the Trustees of The California State University:

Celia I. Ballesteros	San Diego

Representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges:

Peter Finnegan	San Francisco

1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone (916) 445-7933